

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

REBECCA T. SHUMYE,

Plaintiff,

v.

SAMUEL D. FELLEKE,

Defendant

No. C-06-3322 MMC

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
APPLICATION TO PROCEED IN FORMA
PAUPERIS ON APPEAL**

The Court is in receipt of plaintiff's Application To Proceed In Forma Pauperis, filed April 8, 2008, by which plaintiff seeks permission to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal.

On June 13, 2006, the Court¹ granted plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis before the district court. On April 4, 2008, the Court filed an "Order: (1) Granting in Part and Denying in Part Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment [and] (2) Denying Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment" ("Order"). On April 8, 2008, plaintiff filed a "Notice of Appeal" from the Order, as well as a "Petition for Review" of the Order.

A party who has been permitted to proceed in forma pauperis in a district court action may proceed on appeal in forma pauperis, unless the district court "certifies that the appeal is not taken in good faith." See Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(3). Here, plaintiff seeks to appeal an interlocutory order, i.e., an order that is nonappealable. See Simons v. United

¹The matter was reassigned to the undersigned on April 7, 2008.

1 States, 497 F. 2d 1046, 1050 (9th Cir. 1974) (holding order denying motion for summary
2 judgment is “nonappealable order”); see also LaTrieste Restaurant & Cabaret, Inc. v.
3 Village of Port Chester, 96 F. 3d 598, 599 (2nd Cir. 1996) (stating general rule that order
4 granting partial summary judgment is nonappealable order). Consequently, the Court
5 “certifies that the appeal is not taken in good faith.” See Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(3).

6 Accordingly, plaintiff’s application to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal is hereby
7 DENIED.

8 The Clerk is directed to serve a copy of this order on the Ninth Circuit Court of
9 Appeals.

10 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

11
12 Dated: April 14, 2008


MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge